ISSN 0304-0003 LIAS 29 (2002) 1

P. J. A. N. RIETBERGEN

JAPAN: THE 'UN-KNOWABLE OTHER'?

TWO SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY EUROPEAN MODELS FOR 'KNOWING' JAPAN*

Floating above the ancient town,
a haven of scholarship-
Nichibunken
Tameyama

Microscope and telescope: Deshima between Japan and the western world

Many readers will have seen the succesful 1980's TV series *Shogun*, with the then ubiquitous Richard Chamberlain in the role of Will Adams, the English pilot who, aboard the Dutch vessel "De Liefde" – the former ship "Erasmus" -, found himself shipwrecked in Beppu Bay, on the coast of the Japanese island of Kyushu. This happened in April of the year 1600.

From that year we date Dutch relations with Japan. Or rather, in the year 2000, Dutch and Japanese government officials looking for an excuse to once more find an occasion for a celebration that would bolster up foreign relations decided to do so, albeit mistakenly. But just as the millennium celebrations were staged in the wrong year, so was this fourcentenary, that actually should be commemorated in 2009. For it was only in 1609 that the Dutch East India Company was given the much-coveted, vermillion-sealed letter that declared to all concerned that the Tokugawa shoguns who ruled Japan from their castle at Edo allowed the Company's servants to trade with Japan.[1] For the following three decades, the Dutch shared this privilege with a number of European competitors, the English, but also the Portuguese and the Spaniards – because during these years Portugal was part of the Spanish crowns.

Actually, the Portuguese had 'discovered' Japan in the 1540s, when missionaries and merchants had first established relationships with the island empire.[2] Europe's discovery of Japan – and, of course, of China, where the Portuguese had gained a foothold as well, on the rocky outcrop called Macao – heralded the first period in

*I would like to thank the members of the Asia-group of the NIAS year 1999-2000 for their intellectual support and, especially, Willem Boot for his critical eye.

1) Actually, the grant was given by ex-shogun Ieyasu, the first Tokugawa, who, behind the screen, continued to hold the reins of power even after his son Hidetada had succeeded him.

2) Cfr. Charles Boxer, *The Christian Century in Japan, 1549-1650*, Berkeley 1951, and: L. Bourdon, *La Compagnie de Jésus et le Japon, 1547-1570*, Paris 1993, but originally 1949.

'European' history during which Europeans showed something like a sustained consciousness of the relativity of their own cultural achievements. This was the result of the growing awareness that here were two cultures as civilised as or perhaps even more civilised than Europe itself.[3] That awareness was created by a veritable avalanche of publications which, from the late sixteenth century onwards, helped to form Europe's knowledge of China and Japan.[4] Many dozens of books, most of them written by Jesuit missionaries or on the basis of their annual reports, met an increasingly appreciative readership who not only were fed with adventurous travel tales detailing exotic societies but were also given such thought-provoking essays as the ones composed by Luís Froís, S. J. in his *litterae annuae* for the Jesuit headquarters in Rome; he expressly sought to compare the various manifestations of Japanese and European culture in his own times.[5]

In the first years of the seventeenth century, the Tokugawa family took over power in Japan, by gaining the shogunate, i.e. the right to rule on behalf of Japan's divine emperor. The first Tokugawa shogun exhibited a growing fear of the disruptive influence of Iberian christianity on the cultural and, indeed, religious homogeneity of Japan, within the context of his concern over the necessary reorganization of the country after more than a century of civil war. From their power base at Edo, present-day Tokyo, the Tokugawa shoguns implemented a change of policy, that slowly but ineradicably decreased the former cultural openness. Soon, the Tokugawa and their regime decided to force the Japanese converts to apostasize and adopt buddhism again, or be expelled, while they also embarked on a policy to oust the foreign christians, the Europeans[6]. This policy was completed in the late 1630's.

However, aware of the importance to retain some contact with the world of the lucrative European and Asian commerce, the new rulers made an exception for the Dutch East India Company. For the Dutch showed a gratifying – albeit in Japanese eyes humiliatingly servile – willingness to comply with Japan's rather stringent political, economic and cultural demands and restrictions. As the Portuguese had done, too, the servants of the VOC put up with their all but total imprisonment on the artificial island of Deshima, in het harbour of Nagasaki, where they were forced to live from 1641 onwards; they also promised they would never publicly show their adherence to the christian faith.

3) Cfr. P. J. A. N. Rietbergen, 'Varieties of Asia? European perspectives, ca 1600-1800', in: E. van den Boogaart, red., *Itinerario*, XXV, 3/4, Leiden 2002, 69-89.

4) For a survey: W. Demel, 'Abundantia, Sapientia, Decadencia. Zum Wandel des Chinabildes vom 16. zum 18. Jahrhundert', in: U. Bitterli, E. Schmitt., red., *Die Kenntnis beider "Indien" im frühneuzeitlichen Europa*, München 1991, 129-153. The catalogue of the great exhibition on *Japan und Europa, 1543-1929*, Berlin 1993, is a 'must'. The study by J. Proust, *L'Europe au prisme du Japon, XVIe-XVIIIe siècle*, Paris 1997, while stimulating, also contains far too many mistakes and parti-pris to be completely trustworthy.

5) Cfr. J. F. Schütte, ed., *Luis Fróis, Kulturgegensätze Europa-Japan – Tratado em que se contem muito susinta e abreviadamente algumas contradicoes e diferencias de custumes antre a gente de Europa e esta provincia de Japao*, Tokyo 1955. There is a French translation of the Portuguese edition by X. de Castro, R. Schrumpf, J. M. Garcia, eds., *Luis Fróis, Traité sur les contradictions de moeurs entre Européens et Japonais*, Paris 1994, and: E. Jorissen, *Das Japanbild im "Tratat" (1585) des Luis Fróis*, Münster 1988.

6) The best survey of the period is: C. Totman, *Early Modern Japan*, Berkeley 1993.

For the following 200 hundred years, the men serving the Dutch Company were the only Europeans to have access to Japan. This created the rather unique situation wherein a very tiny group formed the sole link between these two worlds, and, thus, became the interpreter of an entire culture, the Japanese one, to the West. Europe now used Deshima as the telescope through to watch the island empire. Though most Company officials had no noticeable interest in Japan or things Japanese other than the financial profit their stay might bring them, a few of Deshima's temporary inhabitants were absolutely fascinated by the world of which they were only given such a tantalizing glimpse. This group, of whom many were not Dutch at all – indeed, the VOC recruited its personnel from all over Europe, with many of them coming from the German and Scandinavian countries[7] – produced a number of extensive travelogues, most of them published in the Northern Netherlands.[8] Often translated into English, French and German, they were eagerly read by an increasingly large group of educated Europeans, who craved information about the other world, either for scholarly and scientific reasons or because the prevailing exoticism stimulated their appetite. Till the middle of the nineteenth century, the books written by VOC-officials were Europe's or indeed the western world's only sources of more or less recent knowledge about Japan. For though, especially in catholic circles in Europe, the older, Jesuit-based literature continued to be used in sometimes deceptively 'new' studies – mostly compilations, often produced by hack writers – the Japanese experience as embodied in these texts became, of course, increasingly outdated. For Japanese society changed as it was increasingly influenced by the Tokugawa regime. Thus, despite the restrictions imposed on their presence in Japan, only the Company's servants were able to convey something of the country's changing reality.

This actually meant that, for more than two centuries, Europe's first hand knowledge of Japan was formed by less than a dozen books, only. Moreover, the authors of these books all had an extremely limited knowledge of Japan, for none of them saw more of the actual country than was possible during the heavily guarded annual embassy of obedience that brought them from Nagasaki to the shogunal court at Edo. The remainder of their notions of Japan were shapen through their sparse contacts with a few Japanese middlemen and, in those rare cases wherein VOC-officials actually learned the language of Nihon, by their reading of Japanese texts. Consequently, whatever the impact of these texts on their European readership, we should realize that the Deshima-stationed authors only had a microscopic view of the world they tried to depict.

7) Cfr. R. van Gelder, *Het Oost-Indisch avontuur. Duitsers in dienst van de VOC*, Nijmegen 1997.

8) For a survey of the production of VOC-officials in the field of travel literature in general, see: P. J. A. N. Rietbergen, 'Wie verre reizen doet ... Compagniesdienaren en andere schrijvende reizigers', in: L. Blussé, I. Ooms, red., *Kennis en Compagnie*, Amsterdam 2002, 164-184.

The "I" and the "You", the "Self" and the "Other" – a hermeneutic opposition

In recent years, scholars have identified the various stages people go through when confronted with persons they somehow perceive of as being 'other'.[9] The very fact of recognising someone as 'other' implies, of course, a conscious or, more likely, unconscious concept of 'self', a notion that enables the "I" to judge in which ways he is different from the "You". Inevitably, in this situation the "I" always begins to take itself as the norm that structures the knowledge of 'the Other'. The process may then further develop in two ways. Often, people will decide – again consciously or unconsciously – not to bother to really try and understand 'the Other'; for a complex of reasons, the Other is stigmatised as an outsider, which usually implies that one feels he poses a threat to the accepted order. He may, then, be termed an 'unorderly' person, strange and dangerous, perhaps, a madman even, or an outright enemy – and, usually, in a cultural sense, a foreigner, and, often, a barbarian. This mostly happens if a person in encountering an 'Other' feels he is powerful enough to act out the role of superior or if that person has an ideological need to construct such a role. The alternative, far less common, alas, is acknowledging 'the Other' as different but, somehow, worthy of positive attention. The next step then will be to change a vague mental attitude into an intellectually more rigid one. This means devising the concepts in which 'the Other', and his culture, can somehow be grasped. However, this will almost certainly not lead to an understanding of 'the Other', and his foreign culture on their own terms – indeed, many would argue this is existentially impossible. But despite these limitations, such an attitude may yet result in decisions which will then allow desirable elements of the other culture to be integrated in one's own life. If the process is reciprocated by the 'other' culture, a mutually fruitful exchange may even result.

If we want to study this process as a sequence of mental steps, on the basis of the various cultural manifestations that, as equally many sources, allow us to actually enter the workings of the mind of past humans, we need identifiable discourses and, therefore, a context of literate societies. For those civilizations which communicate orally, only, are structured through totally different mnemonic devices and, moreover, have a different mental make-up which makes a scholarly analysis of their world views and the accompanying cultural processes very difficult indeed. However, in the specific case of Japan and Europe we do have two evidently literate societies and, at least on the European side, a number of apposite texts, viz. the accounts of Japan, its physical nature, its economy, its culture and its politics as written from the vantage point that was Deshima.

Due to their nature, these accounts can be used for many scholarly purposes. Over the years, a number of scholars have searched them for details that would help them to reconstruct the Japanese past – given the fact that these accounts, as

9) I have tried to deal with the historical and epistemological problems involved in: P. J. A. N. Rietbergen, 'Oriëntalisme – een theorie van ficties of de fictie van een theorie? Een poging tot contextualisering en herinterpretatie', in: *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis*, 111 (1998), 545-575. Another significant contribution is: M. L. Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, London 1992.

testimonies written by outsiders, do give information Japanese sources do not provide; such a scholarly analysis inevitably entails determining whether the European travelogues written in the Deshima-era were correct representations when measured against the realities of contemporary Japanese life the writers actually could have availed themselves of. However, this type of analysis certainly is not my objective. Rather, it is my aim to look at these texts as the fascinating 'corpus' they also are: a series of European representations of another world that can and indeed should be mutually compared, for they offer marvellous material for an essay in imagology.

It is my aim to find out what information about Japan the authors decided to give their European readers and, moreover, what ways they choose to structure and present their tales. Obviously, within that context the engraved plates that often came with these texts – although not necessarily produced by the writers or, indeed, by other eye-witnesses – offer an important source for further analysis as well.

More importantly, I am fascinated by the question whether the choices the authors made must be read as manifestations of the cultural and, more narrowly speaking, scholarly climate in Europe at the time of writing, or publishing; in one of the major cases – Engelbert Kaempfer's text, of which more later – the manuscript was only published some twentyfive years after the author's death, and then in a translated and obviously altered form. However, I will also have to find out whether these choices show the marks of the increasing freedom the Dutch were actually given by the Japanese authorities in the course of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century.

Secondly, I hope to determine in which ways the authors of the succesive books were influenced by their predecessors. Did they view their knowledge as a corpus that should grow with new experiences and observations, and should function within a continuum of scholarly discourse? Or did they rather retell the old stories, perhaps in a new guise, but still assuming that their readers would have forgotten that earlier works about Japan actually existed.

This brings me to a third question. If most authors simply rehashed the same information rather than contrast their own views of Japan with the older ones, this may indicate that despite the manifestly scholarly presentation of most texts, the books actually also addressed another perhaps less critical readership – that far wider one of arm-chair travellers and lovers of the exotic. In tackling this issue, I also may be able to gain some insight into the general question in which ways knowledge and learning were transmitted in early modern Europe. To delve a bit deeper into this specific problem, I need to know what kind of reception these publications had. Of course, it is impossible to do anything in the way of proper readership research. Yet even a survey of the various editions and translations will help me to establish which markets Dutch and other European publishers aimed at.

If I can solve all these problems and answer all these questions, I hope to end up knowing what, at least theoretically, was the extent of Europe's knowledge of this elusive world at the other end of the globe during the two centuries of the Dutch presence, there. Thus, I can try to find out in which ways Europe was allowed and allowed itself to understand the world in general, and Japan in particular. It is a topic

that I find important from a historical point of view. However, I think it also is a topic that has a significant bearing on present-day global culture: if we can grasp how our understanding of other peoples, other cultures is actually gained and structured, we may, perhaps, improve that comprehension and overcome some of the limits imposed on it by a variety of factors.

This article, then, hopes to be both a statement of work in progress – for a number of the above questions will not be answered, here – and, hopefully, a meaningful contribution to solving the problem which, of course, is basic to the topic, the problem of the epistemology of the European travelogue in the early modern period.

The books that 'made' Japan

Several dozens of sometimes very important and perceptive but – by Rome – heavily censured Jesuit testimonies of Japan were published in Europe between the 1550's and the 1630's. During the 1630's, the European missionaries were expelled from Japan, and the Portuguese and English traders left as well. From that time onwards, until the opening of Japan to the world in the 1850's, only some ten books based on some kind of first-hand experience of Japan were written.

The first one in the series of what I would term the VOC-books was written by a man whom we might call the first Dutch 'japonologist'. He was François Caron (1600-1673)[10], who headed the Dutch factory in Japan when it was still established at Hirado. His account of Japan and things Japanese is precisely important because it is the first and last one written from the vantage point of a person who still was able to travel relatively freely through Tokugawa Japan – a liberty denied to the Dutch from the 1640's onwards.

Strictly limiting myself to accounts published by eye witnesses, the next important book is the one written by the German scholar-physician Engelbert Kaempfer (1651-1716), who lived on Deshima in the 1690's. The Dutch translation of his work was published in Amsterdam in 1729. The title indicates its scope and pretensions:

De Beschryving van Japan, behelsende een verhaal van den ouden en tegenwoordigen staat en regering van dat ryk, van deszelfs tempels, paleysen, kasteelen en andere gebouwen, van deszelfs metalen, mineralen, boomen, planten, dieren, vogelen en visschen. van de tydrekening, en opvolging van de geestelyke en wereldlyke keyzers. Van de oorspronkelyke afstamming, godsdiensten, gewoonten en handwerkselen der inboorlingen, en van hunnen koophandel met de Nederlanders en de Chineesen. Benevens eene beschryving van het koningkryk Siam.

Uyt het oorspronkelyk Hoogduytsch handschrift, nooit te voren gedrukt, in het Engels overgezet, door J. G. Scheuchzer, lidt van de Koninklyke Maat-

10) On him, see the introductory notes by: C. R. Boxer, ed., *A True Description of the Mighty Kingdoms of Japan and Siam, By Caron and Schouten*, London 1935, xv-cxxix, that, however, are not without mistakes.

schappy, en van die der Geneesheeren in Londen. Die daarby gevoegt heeft het Leven van den Schryver.

Voorzien met kunstige kopere platen, onder het opzicht van den ridder Hans Sloane uytgegeven, en uyt het Engelsch in 't Nederduytsch vertaalt.[11]

Many decades later, Kaempfer's work was followed by a text written by the Swedish biologist Carl Thunberg (1743-1828)[12], a proper pupil of his professor, Carl Linnaeus, who admonished his students to travel in the service of science. He narrated his reminiscences of his stay in Japan in the 1770's in a four-volume description of the voyages which, indeed, had taken him all over the world. The *Resa uti Europa, Africa, Asia, förrätted Aren 1770-1779* [Travels made in Europe, Africa, and Asia during the years 1770-1779] was published in Uppsala between 1788 and 1793. The 'Voyage to the Empire of Japan in the years 1775 and 1776' must have been its *pièce de résistance*, in view of the fact that most translations only highlighted this part of the larger book. The Japan-part of Thunberg's travels appeared in German, French and English in, respectively, 1792, 1796 en 1801. The Dutch version, titled *Verhandeling over de Japansche natie, haare zeeden, gebruiken en haare munten* [Treatise about the Japanese nation, its morals, customs and coins] predates even the Swedish one – it was published in 1780 – which seems to indicate that a Dutch publisher realized its potential, perhaps precisely because, since the publication of Kaempfer's book, fifty years earlier, no substantial eye-witness account of Japan had been produced in Europe despite the growing interest in exotic cultures.

The work of Isaac Titsingh (1745-1812), Director of Deshima in the 1780s and, like Kaempfer, often called the first 'japanologist' is interesting enough.[13] He produced a series of essays dealing with such specific topics of Japanese culture as the production of sake and tea. Far more remarkably, he was the first European ever to try his hand at the translation of that famous genre of Japanese poetry, the *haiku*, which he rendered into Latin. But he did not write a general survey of Japan in the manner of his predecessors and successors. Despite its misleading title, *Bijzonderheden over Japan* [Particularities about Japan], the book that was published in The Hague in 1824 – after it had first appeared in French and in English – is a study of ceremony and ritual at the shogunal and imperial courts.

11) The complete English title was: *The History of Japan, Giving an Account of the Ancient and Present State and Government of that Empire; Of Its Temples, Palaces, Castles, and other Buildings; Of its Metals, Minerals, Trees, Plants, Annimals, Birds and Fishes; Of the Chronology, and Succession of the Emperors, Ecclesiastical and Secular; of The Original Descent, Religion, Customs, and Manufactures of the Natives; and of their Trade and Commerce with the Dutch and Chinese: Together with a Description of the Kingdom of Siam, Written in High-Dutch by Engelbertus Kaempfer M. D., Physician to the Dutch Embassy to the Emperors Court; and translated from his Original Manuscript, never before printed, by J. G. Scheuchzer, F. R. S., and a Member of the College of Physicians, London. With the Life of the Author, and an Introduction. Illustrated with many Copper Plates*, London 1727.

12) On him, see: C. Steenstrup, 'A Gustavian Swede in Tanuma Okitsuga's Japan: Marginal Notes on Carl Peter Thunberg's Travelogue', in: *The Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 6 (1979), 20-42.

13) See: F. Lequin, *Isaac Titsingh (1745-1812). Een passie voor Japan. Leven en werk van de grondlegger van de Europese japanologie*, Alphen a.d. Rijn 2002.

Hendrik Doeff (1777-1835) was the man with, perhaps, the longest experience of Japan ever, at least among the Dutchmen of the Deshima period. After his arrival on the island in 1799, he became "Opperhoofd" in 1803 and stayed on in that function for the next fifteen years, also because the Napoleonic wars in Europe had severed the links between the Dutch colonial administration on Java and the directors of the East Indian affairs in the Netherlands. Doeff only returned there in 1818, finding that the Dutch Republic had become a kingdom and that the East India Company had been dissolved in the very year he had left for the Indies, its possessions now part of the new king's overseas domains. The ruins of a mercantile network that had been slowly turning into an empire of sorts had to be rebuilt, and the question was posed whether Deshima, by now of rather peripheral economic importance, still warranted the money spent on it. Doeff's story only was published in 1830, in Haarlem, under the simple title *Herinneringen uit Japan* [Memories of Japan] – a title perhaps more significant than it's sober wording suggests, given the fact that Doeff maintained that he had returned twelve years earlier with a publishable text which, however, had been lost on his voyage from the Dutch East Indies to Patria, which had forced him to re-write the entire story from memory.

Doeff may have been prompted to publish and, in doing so, stress his own role because, by the 1830's, others were busy stressing theirs. Germain Meijlan (1785-1831), the Deshima "Opperhoofd" in 1826, had given the public his *Japan, voorgesteld in schetsen over de zeden en gebruiken van dat rijk* [Japan, represented in sketches on the morals and customs of that empire], produced by the newly-founded Deshima Press in 1829, and then went on to also publish it in Amsterdam, in 1830. But there were others even more willing to convince the world of their unique role as mediator between the West en Japan. In the 1830's, the German physician Philip von Siebold who had been stationed on Deshima and, admittedly, had become a highly-acclaimed teacher to those Japanese who wanted to embrace western medicine, had started to publish his views of Japan. His work, which clearly meant to emulate Kaempfer's of a hundred years earlier, was published in installments as: *Nippon: Archiv zur Beschreibung von Japan und dessen Neben- und Schutzländern [...] nach japanischen und europäischen Schriften und eigenen Beobachtungen bearbeitet.* The German doctor was loved by those members of the Japanese intelligentsia who, craving at western knowledge, thought him a scientific god; however, he was hated by at least a number of Dutchmen who deprecated his obvious vanity but at the same time were envious of the unprecedented freedom he had been given by the Japanese authorities to travel around and talk to people. Undeniably, Siebold was a good observer although, perhaps, not as original a writer as he claimed to be. But he did not finish the job he had undertaken. The final version of his *Nippon* was produced by his sons, at the end of the nineteenth century, at a time when Japan had 'opened' its borders to the world at large. By then, a series of new analyses of the now rapidly rising Empire of the Rising Sun were being produced by scholars and other curious people from all over the western world: the Dutch monopoly on knowledge of things Japanese finally was broken.

Meanwhile, during the early 1820's, Johan van Overmeer Fisscher had been manager of the Deshima warehouses and, in 1822, had accompanied the then

director on his customary embassy-of-obedience to Edo. Fisscher's *Bijdrage tot de Kennis van het Japansche Rijk* [Contribution to the knowledge of the Japanese empire], published in Amsterdam in 1833, is an unpretentious, readable book. Cornelis van Assendelft de Coningh (1821-1890), captain of a ship that made the trip to Japan in 1845 and 1851, wrote *Mijn verblijf in Japan* [My stay in Japan], that was published in Amsterdam in 1856. It was the last 'substantial' work on Japan to result from the two hundred years of the Dutch presence on Deshima.

Two models revealed?

Following the first publication of Caron's survey in 1645, between the 1640's and the 1730's, only two substantial books describing the Japanese empire and its inhabitants appeared that, albeit in different ways, were based on recent, first-hand knowledge of Japan after its virtual closure to the outside world. These two studies, the first ones written on the limited basis of the Company's Deshima-experience, embody the two models that, I think, Europe always has used to describe and analyze its views of Japan as 'the Other'.

The first text appeared in Amsterdam, with the publisher Van Meurs, in 1669 and was titled *Gedenkwaerdige Gesantschappen der Oost-Indische Maetschappy in 't Vereenigde Nederland aen de Kaisaren van Japan; vervaetende Wonderlijke voorvallen op de Togt der Nederlandsche Gesanten; Beschryving van de Dorpen, Sterkten, Steden, Landschappen, Tempels, Gods-diensten, Dragten, Gebouwen, Dieren, Gewaschen, Bergen, Fonteinen, vereeuwde en nieuwe Oorlogs-daeden der Japanders: Verciert met een groot getal Afbeeldsels in Japan geteikent: Getrokken uit de Geschriften en Reis-aentekeningen derzelve Gesanten door Arnoldus Montanus,* or, to give an English translation of its short title *Memorable Embassies of the East India Company of the United Netherlands to the Emperor of Japan*. The author, Aernoud van Bergen or Arnoldus Montanus (1625-1683) was a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church who, actually, never saw Japan or, indeed, anything Japanese beyond the texts and objects that were available in Holland. However, Montanus wrote his work on the basis of the information contained in the extensive but mostly secret manuscript reports of a number of Dutch envoys who had visited the Court at Edo in the 1640's, '50s and '60s – notably Frisius, Wagenaar and Van Zelderen. However, he also based his description on a vast reading of almost everything written on Japan in any European language in the century since the 1540's, culminating in the printed *litterae annuae* of the Jesuits and in the books published by them till the moment they were banished from Japan.

Montanus's dedication provides an important clue to what lay behind his enterprise. It connects his Japan-book to the Witsen family of Amsterdam merchant princes and powerful regents, and more specifically to Cornelis Witsen and his son Nicholas who, through their directorships in the Dutch East and West Indian Company, were at the center of a network that spanned the entire known world. Both Cornelis and, even more so, Nicholas, quite surprisingly used these contacts not only to further their commercial enterprises but also to gather and distribute knowledge about the farthest reaches of the earth.[14] They were involved in the

14) Cfr. P. J. A. N. Rietbergen, 'Witsen's World. Nicolaas Witsen (1642-1717) between the Dutch

publication of the famous and highly succesful travelogues of Johan Nieuhof, but also of the widely-read compilations of Asian history assembled by Olfert Dapper. It must have been men like Cornelis Witsen who enabled Montanus to gain access to the Company's archives; this happened after the Company had decided – sometime in the 1640's – to abandon its policy of keeping its archives closed, for a new approach that tended, by the publication of sumptuous travel books, to stress the Company's function as a collective patron – in this respect, the VOC heralded the pr-policies of the multinationals of the twentieth century. Indeed, it seems that the very choice of Montanus was dictated by the fact that he could be relied on to write a higly readable, and not overtly critical book that would show off the Company's commercial and cultural significance.

Engelbert Kaempfer, the author of the second text, *The Description of Japan* cited already, not only had lived in Japan, but also had travelled to Edo not once but twice. His obviously was an investigative mind. In his endeavours to know more about Japan, he was assisted by a young Japanese apprentice who was willing to answer all his questions, to translate for him and, illegally, buy him every book and map he wanted. Without him, Kaempfer could not have accumulated the huge mass of material on the island empire that, back in Europe, he began to analyze, describe and, slowly, shape into a great survey. He never finished his self-imposed task. His manuscript text and notes, as well as the maps, drawings and translated Japanese books he had brought with him, were bought by the court physician of King George I of England, Sir Hans Sloane. This famous collector then commissioned the young Swiss scholar Joseph Scheuchzer, whom he engaged as his librarian, to complete Kaempfer's work and prepare it for a publication in English. Scheuchzer, who became a member of the Royal Society and, in 1728, its foreign secretary, was faced with a huge task, for Kaempfer's German manuscript text and notes were anything but a complete, let alone unequivocal treatise. Contrary to tradition, I would argue that the published book, which has been used by so many modern scholars both western and Japanese to reconstruct Tokugawa Japan at the end of the seventeenth century, owes far more to Scheuchzer than we like to think – there always is a tendency to hero worship a well-known author, rather than accepting that his work was shaped by an otherwise unknown man. Scheuchzer's English version was first published in 1727, and soon translated into Dutch, French and German; a German version by C. Dohm, based, according to its author, on Kaempfer's original manuscript, only was published in 1776.[15] In short, we should realize it is actually Scheuchzer's rendition and interpretation of Kaempfer's notes which has been commonly cited up till now. The fact that an English translation of Kaempfer's

East India Company and the 'Republic of Letters', in: *Itinerario*, IX (1985) 2, 121-134.

15) H. Beck, ed., *Engelbert Kaempfer, Geschichte und Beschreibung von Japan. Aus den Originalhandschriften des Verfassers herausgegeben von Christian Wilhelm Dohm (1777-1779)*, I-II, Stuttgart 1964. However, this edition, too, is not the 'original' one. Recently, a version that, according to its editor, really is based on Kaempfer's original manuscripts was published: B. Bodart-Bailey, *Kaempfer's Japan: Tokugawa culture observed*, Honolulu 1999. However, even this edition has its problems. At present, a team of mostly German editors is working on the 'official' publication of Kaempfer's entire oeuvre, the Japan-book included.

original German manuscript text has now become available is, howevermuch it will allow us to gauge the author's own ideas, of no use at all in measuring the ways his text, through Scheuchzer's version, has influenced Europe's views of Japan during the eighteenth century.[16]

The ways knowledge is structured can, of course, best be analysed by looking at its presentation. Opening the two books – Montanus and Kaempfer-Scheuchzer – one is faced with a table of contents and, at the end, an index of sorts. As is well known, from the sixteenth century onwards books produced in the Netherlands were among the first European texts to have reasonably accurate indexes and most publishers soon adopted this new idea. This in itself is an indication of the increasing topicalization and classification of knowledge. The question whether this phenomenon and the subsequent proliferation of the encyclopedia – which, after all, is an index turned into a book – have been influenced by the Jesuits' admiration for the huge encyclopaedic endeavours of the Chinese literati has not yet been decided.[17]

Thus, on the surface, the books written by Montanus and Kaempfer are more or less identical. Both have, of course, a dedication and a preface. Montanus's book has a preface ostensibly written by publisher Jacob van Meurs; obviously, it is a product of Montanus's own easy pen. He writes that

> "if anyone ever thought that the peoples living under the eastern skies are not blessed with a sharp mind, in reading these pages he will quickly discover that the Japanese mind is not inferior to any in statecraft, knowledge of warfare, civil behaviour and proper housekeeping."[18]

It can be argued that this amounts to nothing less than an open invitation to comparison.

Scheuchzer, in the dedication of his version of Kaempfer's text to King George I, writes that the book

> "gives an account of a mighty and powerful Empire, which owes its Greatness to itself, and the flourishing condition it is in, to its being debarr'd all Communication with other Nations."[19]

This seems a tribute to Tokugawa seclusion policy; a rather unexpected one, given the fact that precisely this policy was heavily criticised in eighteenth-century Europe. But the very fact that Japan's uniqueness was stressed seems to preclude a comparative attitude on the reader's part. Obviously, Scheuchzer had deduced his laudatory words from Kaempfer's own very favourable judgement of this so-called *Sakoku*-system. In his 1712-publication of essays titled *Amoenitates*, Kaempfer himself had written of the Japanese that

> "their pride and warlike humour being set aside, they are as civil, as polite and as curious a nation as any in the world, naturally inclined to commerce and

16) Bodart-Bailey, ed., transl., o.c., *Kaempfer's Japan*. Cfr. also: B. M. Bodart-Bailey, D. Massarella, *The Furthest Goal. Engelbert Kaempfer's Encounter with Tokugawa Japan*, Folkestone 1995.

17) I have drawn attention to the possibility in: P. J. A. N. Rietbergen, 'Zover de Aarde reikt. De werken van Johan Nieuhof (1619-1672) als illustratie van het probleem der cultuur- en mentaliteitsgeschiedenis tussen specialisatie en integratie', in: *De Zeventiende Eeuw*, II (1986) 1, 17-40.

18) *Montanus*, o.c., Opdracht.

19) *Scheuchzer/Kaempfer*, o.c., Dedication.

familiarity with foreigners, and desirous, to excess, to be informed of their histories, arts and sciences."[20]

So, both Montanus and Kaempfer/Scheuchzer definitely were favourably disposed to the culture they set out to describe, though they chose very different paths to show their appreciation.

Turning to the texts themselves, in both cases the writers more or less follow the rules set out by the *Ars Apodemica*, the art of writing travel tales that had developed in Europe since the seventeenth century but took its rules partly from classical poetical and rhetorical devices. In the accepted scheme of such texts, an author always began with a description of a region's nature and geography, continuing with flora and fauna, the physical appearance of the inhabitants, et cetera. Normally, a second chapter would deal with history, a third one with religion, and so on. Both Montanus and Kaempfer adopt this scheme, starting with a geographical and historical introduction that includes a discussion of the much disputed origins of the Japanese people. But rather than going on in the 'approved vein', which gave most European travelogues of the seventeenth and eighteenth century such a uniform aspect, both as to composition and as to content, Montanus then proceeds along rather different lines. Yet I will deal with the Kaempfer-Scheuchzer text first because, in a way, it conforms most closely to what westerners had come to expect of a scholarly analysis of a country's culture.

Kaempfer's work is divided into five books. The first, geographical one continues with a very detailed description of the country's climate, its mineral resources, its vegetation and its animal life. The second book deals with the history of Japan through a detailed listing of the Japanese emperors – whom Kaempfer called the 'ecclesiastical hereditary emperors', to distinguish them from the Tokugawa shoguns whom the Dutch, for some decades, had mistaken for the actual emperors. Through his list, Kaempfer takes the history of Japan from times immemorial up to the years he himself stayed on Deshima, during the shogunate of the fifth Tokugawa, Tsunayoshi.

The third book deals with the various religions of Japan, starting with Shinto and going on to Buddhism and ending with Zen which, though it was a Buddhist sect, Kaempfer viewed as a different religion of which he stressed the philosophical character. The fourth book is devoted to Nagasaki and its trade and, of course, more specifically to the role of Deshima and the Dutch. Only in the fifth and last book do the author's personal experiences get into the text and does one get a view of Japan, so to say: it describes the two journeys Kaempfer was allowed to make from Nagasaki to Edo.

Now, Montanus's book, written some decades earlier, is organised in a very different way. After the introductory chapter, Montanus's text takes its structure from the roads that both geographically and mentally were essential to the one and only experience of Japan all European authors writing after 1641 and before 1854 were allowed to have: the roads leading from Nagasaki to Edo, that is to say mainly

20) Cfr. the Japan-part of the *Amoenitates*, included in: *Scheuchzer/Kaempfer*, o.c., as appendix VI.

the *Saikaido* and, most important, the *Tokaido*. Thus, a spatial dimension rather than another, more intellectually abstract, topical way of classifying experience determines Montanus's presentation and, consequently, the impressions gained by his reader. Japan is a string of villages, towns, castles, monasteries along the famous Southern Sea Road. Japan is the people who travel along this road: the occasional imperial princess on her way to Ise, the national shrine which held the imperial jewels – these the gifts of the Sun Goddess Amaterasu of whom the emperors claimed descent; the shogunal envoys sent to the imperial court at Kyoto; the great daimyo with their hundreds of retainers beginning or ending their season of 'compulsory residence' – seen by many as virtual imprisonment – in their Edo *yashiki*, the mansions they were forced to maintain, at great expense, as part of the shoguns' policy to curb their power; also, Japan is strange, almost naked men, their private parts barely covered, carrying others in their *cango*'s and *norimon*s over hill and through dale. Finally, Japan is the flotsam and jetsam of society, the *yamabushi* and the *bikuni*, a bunch of monks and nuns who, however, lead the lives of beggars and whores and divert or importune the other travelers on the great post roads.

Most VOC-servans writing on Japan after 1641 did acquire some information that would not fit into the rather limited *Tokaido*-scheme of things Japanese. They did so either through reading – most likely in the manuscript *Dagregisters* kept by the Opperhoofd at Deshima – or through conversations, for example with the members of the Nagasaki interpreters' guild. Kaempfer and his few intellectual successors during the eighteenth century organised all these data in the separate paragraphs or chapters which fitted into the overall thematic structure of their books. Only in the nineteenth century, when a more personal, indeed romantic vision of the author as eye-witness, of the adventurer-traveller as a hero made this acceptable, some authors writing about Japan presented such information as, in a way, excursions on their memorable journey along the *Tokaido*. Now this was precisely what Montanus had done two centuries earlier: he inaugurated the Tokaido-scheme of describing Japan; all his information somehow is attached to a place on the Southern Sea Road as seen by the ambassador Frisius and others whose reports of their trips to Edo in the 1640's and 1650's are the backbone of his book.

Yet, however significant, the main difference between Montanus and Kaempfer is not the structure of their books but the way they invite their readers to know Japan and things Japanese. Montanus tries to make his readers understand Japan through comparison. In comparing things, he allowed for a wide range of examples, from the material to the spiritual.

Japan has no mills. Therefore, it does not make bread. Rice serves the purposes which, in Europe, are served by grain.[21]

The Japanese do not fear death. They believe in heroism and in paradise. This feeling, Montanus explains, is neither recent, nor specifically Japanese: the Celts, in Europe, thought that way, too. Also, Herodotus and Strabo have tales which show that such ideas once were common in the European part of the world as well.[22]

21) *Montanus*, o.c., 82.

22) *Montanus*, o.c., 88.

Japanese priests do pretend to be able to heal the sick through all kind of secret sayings. So did the Druids in ancient Europe. Et cetera.

These examples should not mislead one into thinking Montanus wanted to impress his audience with an idea of Japan's culture as traditional, as backward. On the contrary. The fact that the Japanese believe in the migration of souls and that, in this context, they specifically think of monkeys as the receptacles of the souls of dead humans is not so strange, he writes: has not Dr Nicolaas Tulp recently shown in how many respects the monkey actually resembles man in a remarkable way?[23]

His extensive reading gave Montanus a favourable impression of many aspects of Japanese culture which, explicitly or implicitly, he compares to European phenomena such as Japan's architecture, which according to him equals Europe's, while Kaempfer judges it to be totally inferior to Europe's inventions in that field, although, on the other hand, he is greatly impressed by the interior decoration of the palaces.[24] He thinks Japan's music, too, is not to be belittled: it goes in directions unknown in Europe. But it is the Japanese theatre which Montanus praises repeatedly as being far more lively and realistic than anything produced in Europe. As to Japanese rhetorics and public oratory: it puts the arts of the ancient Greeks and Romans to shame.[25]

But Montanus's appreciation goes deeper. He is aware of the Japanese fondness for the sciences: "haer schijnt ingeschaepen een lust tot wetenschappen" – or 'they seem to be innately drawn to the sciences'.[26] He also thinks that in matters of religion the Japanese are very tolerant despite the great variety of creeds and sects. He writes:

> "Nobody causes another person trouble because of differences in faith; indeed, the citizens never publicly quarrel about that issue."[27]

Here, I think, we encounter the beginnings of an attitude which was to become prevalent at the end of the seventeenth century and then developed into one of the components of the Enlightenment: its plea for tolerance, and its willingness to articulate a growing criticism of European situations precisely by comparing them to non-European ones.

Now turning to Kaempfer's text again, reading it immediately reveals that to him the instrument of systematic comparison did not, apparently, offer a solution to the question which he, too, must have asked himself: how to make the reader understand Japan. One of the most interesting points in his text is the supposedly divine origins of the imperial line; Kaempfer frankly rejects these claims without, however, explaining why they existed in the first place.[28] Montanus at least tries to make the situation look less strange than it otherwise would have been by telling his European readers that the fact that so many Japanese emperors are deified as gods or demi-gods should not surprise them: did not the Greeks and the Romans do the same?[29] Implicitly, he made his readers realize that those whom they considered the

23) *Montanus*, o.c., 135-136.
24) *Scheuchzer/Kaempfer*, o.c., 292.
25) *Montanus*, o.c., 138; 140 sqq.; 145.
26) *Montanus*, o.c., 227.
27) *Montanus*, o.c., 262. Cfr. *Scheuchzer/Kaempfer*, o.c., 142.
28) *Scheuchzer/Kaempfer*, o.c., 69 sqq.
29) *Montanus*, o.c., 113.

founding fathers of their own culture were, perhaps, less different from these strange people than they thought.

Not only does Kaempfer fail to allow his readers to understand Japan through the device of inviting them to compare their own world with that of Nihon, nor does he present them with his own evaluation of people and things. Admittedly, he sometimes uses rather strong words as, for example, in condemning Japanese policy against the christians[30] – as Montanus had done, too – and in his discussion of the Japanese character that he sometimes finds suspicious and cruel[31]; in this, too, Montanus had preceded him. But on the whole Kaempfer's presentation is such that it creates a distance between his subject matter and the reader. Japan remains, both literally and figuratively speaking, a country at the other end of the world, which the reader is not allowed to get to know through a conscious presentation of differences and similarities.

Due to these very different ways of presenting Japan, Kaempfer's work, by far the more systematic in a modern – which came to mean: scholarly – way, almost inevitably will strike present-day readers as also being the more trustworthy. In some respects it is, simply because Kaempfer had access to material that most of his predecessors at least in the Deshima-era did not have. But we should not forget that Montanus also used the information from the Jesuit-period, the period in which Europeans still had been free to explore Japan, to an extent that even Kaempfer's extensive notes could not equal. Also, if one compares Montanus's text with Kaempfer's on the same topics, one is struck by the similarity of their findings and interpretations. Thus, Kaempfer's discussion on the origins of the Japanese people – in China, in Central Asia? -, while being more soberly worded than Montanus's somewhat more sensational story, is not really much more enlightening.[32] In short, Montanus' text, despite its less 'scholarly' make-up, is not necessarily less reliable.

Two European texts, two European ways of looking at another world, of trying to know it and make it known to and understood by the reader. Scheuchzer, in his 1727-introduction to Kaempfer, admits that Montanus had assembled almost everything ever written in Europe about Japan and, moreover, had done a valuable job precisely because most information had been almost unobtainable for a long time.[33] Actually, he even shows some open jealousy of a work that, by his own admittance, still caters to a large readership – no mean thing for a book already seventy years old. However, his real, albeit unspoken, problem is, I think, with the way Montanus presented Japan. Scheuchzer vilifies Montanus for his many excursions that deflected the reader from what should be that reader's real purpose; this, presumably, was to be understood as the effort to grasp the sound data about Japan provided by Kaempfer in such an organised, scientific way.

30) *Scheuchzer/Kaempfer*, o.c., 223 sqq; 231. 31) *Scheuchzer/Kaempfer*, o.c., 240, 254, 265-266.
32) *Scheuchzer/Kaempfer*, o.c., 42; 59. *Montanus*, o.c., 4 sqq; 313.
33) *Scheuchzer/Kaempfer*, o.c., 35.

Two models in context

Some readers may, of course, argue that in presenting these two models, I have neglected the fact that one of them is the intellectual construction of a man who never visited Japan in the first place. That is undeniably true although, of course, Montanus did rely heavily on the experiences of people who had actually and indeed quite recently been there. Yet I think that his relative distance may have been one of the reasons why he was able to stand back and adopt his comparative stance. If he had been to Japan, he might have produced a different text. But that still would have left him with the question whether he should have presented his tale in the thematically organised format adopted by men like Kaempfer. Instead, he provided an alternative model of knowledge, one that, to my opinion, has a greater capacity for generating the relativist stance that, perhaps, may lead to some sort of workable cross-cultural understanding.

To explain why Montanus was culturally and indeed mentally able toy write as he did, I have to return to my opening statements. Within societies that have writing and indeed printing skills, the process of knowing and describing 'the Other' follows the pattern I have outlined above. In that case the process is, I think, a fairly universal one, an expression of the literate human mind the world over. Yet it is, of course, governed by specific and indeed very diverse cultural criteria. Although such religions as Buddhism had their influences on Japanese society and, indeed, on the world view of many Japanese, actually Japan's norms for placing 'the Other' were, by and large, set by the Chinese, or rather by the Confucian world order – especially as re-interpreted and formulated anew during the middle decades of the seventeenth century to serve as the ideological basis for Tokugawa authority.[34] Meanwhile, Europe's values and norms were, of course, conditioned by the christian world view despite the fact that, increasingly, European scholarship had a tendency to break away from precisely that view, adopting a more rationalist, disenchanted stance. Yet though Japan and Europe both were culturally restricted in their views of 'the Other', the effects of these restrictions were rather different.

The Confucian world order revolved around one specific normative centre, China, the Middle Kingdom. It was an order to which many Japanese adhered by tracing the descent of their own earliest culture-givers to the earliest Chinese sages. Others, through various arguments, re-interpreted the early history of Japan to accomodate their own view of themselves as 'the Land of the Gods'. But the result was, of course, the same: there was but one normative centre.

No such specific centre dominated the christian world view. Indeed, insofar as christianity had a normative centre, it was always elsewhere, for Paradise or the Promised Land, the places where man and society had been perfect or could be perfect again, never could be where man, in his lapsed state of sinfulness, actually was. Instead, it could and indeed always was looked for in other worlds. These, at

34) There is an ongoing debate on the question what, exactly, constituted the ideological basis of Tokugawa society in the seventeenth century. Cfr. H. Ooms, *Tokugawa Ideology. Early Constructs, 1570-1680*, Princeton 1985, as against, for example, W. Boot, *The adoption and adaptation of neo-Confucianism in Japan*, Leiden 1983.

least on first contact, often were interpreted in a positive way, viz. as being the world Europe had lost.[35] This, I think, explains to a large extent the tendency of a number of European scholars to adopt a comparative view of things; in the end, it sometimes even developed into cultural relativism – a thing that simply could not occur within Japan's neo-confucian world view. To me, Montanus's choice, while obviously dictated by his wish to produce a text that was as readable and, indeed, as 'sensational' as possible, seems indicative of this mental possibility in European culture, while Kaempfer's contribution reflected the other, objectifying approach valued and indeed increasingly favoured by many Europeans as being the more rational, empirical, scientific one. But although Kaempfer did admire Japan in many respects, his distanced and distancing presentation, representative of the majority of early modern European travelogues, the ones on Japan included, probably will not have shaken any of his readers out of their customary European self-complacency. Montanus's comparative lines, however, may just have forced them to think about themselves in some relationship to this alien culture, to ask themselves whether the un-knowable could be understood, after all, because it was presented in a wider, global or perhaps rather creational view from a monogenetical perspective – a view as the one expounded at the end of the seventeenth century by a man like Nicolaas Witsen, the son of Cornelis Witsen to whom Montanus had dedicated his book.[36]

Epilogue

Meanwhile, in Japan itself the traditional japanocentric world view was slowly being eroded. In the seventeenth century, the Japanese authorities still could write to the Governor-General of the Dutch East Indies expressing their contentment of the actions of the director of the Deshima factory in describing him as a "loyal servant of the Shogun". A man like the famous poet Matsuo Basho, who must have seen the Dutch arrive at Edo for their annual embassy of obedience to the shogunal capital, wrote such lines as:

> "Even the Dutch factory captain is obliged to kneel before the magnanimity of our Lord"

– meaning the Tokugawa shogun – or, in another poetic outburst:

> "Even the Hollanders, saddled on their horses, have come to admire our cherry flowers."

During the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, this attitude, while it continued to structure the thoughts of the majority of the Japanese, including, one must admit, the majority of the political elite, yet was complemented by a slowly growing awareness of the West[37], albeit in rather narrowly-circumscribed circles; mostly, these were connected with the guild of translators that had been created to facilitate and, at the same time, control the contacts between the Dutch on Deshima and the

35) Cfr. P. J. A. N. Rietbergen, *Dromen van Europa*, Amersfoort 1994, chapter III.

36) Cfr. Rietbergen, *Witsen's World*, a.c.

37) Cfr. D. Keene, *The Japanese Discovery of Europe, 1720-1830*, Stanford 1969, but originally London 1952.

authorities in Nagasaki and Edo, and, even more, with Japan at large. Significantly, this growing awareness was largely due to the introduction of texts, images and artefacts from the West through the medium of the Dutch on Deshima and their Japanese translators.[38] In 1715, the probably earliest Japanese reflection on the world of the far West – for of course, to Japan, China was the West, too – was Arai Hakuseki's *Seiyokibum*, the 'Informations on the West'. The next year, a new shogun came to power, Tokugawa Yoshimune, and in 1720, the ban on western books was lifted, with the sole exception of texts propagating christianity.

From then on, the Japanese seem to have been particularly interested in such fields of western culture as medicine[39], the sciences and their technological implications and applications, and, in a way more surprising, the visual arts.[40] The changes can be seen in images such as the ones wrought by the artist Shiba Kokan, who produced drawings and paintings in the European style and influenced a number of fellow artists, even including the famous Utagawa Kuniyoshi (1797-1861); texts, too, reveal a greater openness as, e.g., the one written by Honda Toshiaki (1743-1820) who, in his 'Tales of the West', asked himself

> "Why is it that the people of these three cities [meaning London, Paris and Amsterdam], who are human beings like everyone else, have attained such excellence? It is because many centuries have elapsed since they were civilized and because their political institutions are founded on the principles of natural government."[41]

Like in Europe, in Japan, too, the ever increasing confrontation with elements from a foreign culture in combination with a growing dissatisfaction with the restrictions of contemporary indiginous society now led to a more comparatist view that paved the way for change.[42] The subsequent, largely nineteenth-century adoption of things western would, eventually, lead to adaptation of things Japanese, in a process comparable to but faster than the one that, through Europe's contacts with other worlds, had reconfigurated and would continue to reconfigure European culture.

38) A competent survey still is: G. K. Goodman, *The Dutch Impact on Japan, 1640-1853*, Leyden 1967.

39) Cfr. G. Siary, H. Benhamou, ed., *Médecine et société au Japon*, Paris 1994, and the works cited in note 33.

40) Cfr. C. French, ed., *Through Closed Doors: Western Influence on Japanese Art, 1639-1853*, Ann Arbor 1977. Also: M. Sakamoto, *Namban bijutsu*, (Tokyo 1984); R. Neuer, H. Libertson, S. Yoshida, *Ukiyo-e: 250 ans d'estampes japonaises* (Paris 1985), and: T. Sugimoto, *Zuroku Rangaku jiishi*, Tokyo 1985.

41) As translated in: *Keene*, o.c.,

42) Cfr. for an example: H. Nakagawa, *Des Lumières et du comparatisme. Un regard japonais sur le XVIIIe siècle*, Paris 1992.